

## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

### ***Status of the Application***

Prior to entry of this Amendment, claims 1-3, 5, 8-13, 16-19, 21, and 23-27 were pending for examination. An Office Action mailed December 31, 2008 objected to claim 19; rejected claims 1-3, 5, 8-13, 16-19, 21, and 23-25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of U.S. Patent No. 6,717,593 to Jennings (hereinafter "Jennings"), U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2002/0104068 of Barrett et al. (hereinafter "Barrett") and *Compilers: Principles, Techniques, and Tools* by Aho et al. (hereinafter "Aho"); and rejected claims 26 and 27 and under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Jennings, Barrett and Aho, and U.S. Patent No. 5,933,140 to Strahorn et al. (hereinafter "Strahorn").

This amendment amends claims 1 and 19, and cancels claims 26 and 27. No new claims have been added. Hence, after entry of this amendment, claims 1-3, 5, 8-13, 16-19, 21, and 23-25 will stand pending for examination. Claims 1 and 19 are independent claims. The applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the pending claims, for at least the reasons presented below.

### **Claim Amendments**

Claim 1 has been amended to recite "outputting, to a context-based help utility, information about the at least one graphical element identified by parsing the tokens in the web-based application" and "providing context-based help based at least in part on the at least one graphical element in the web-based application." Claim 19 has been amended in similar fashion. Support for these amendments can be found throughout the application, including specifically on pages 3, as well as in portions of the specification supporting prior claims 26 and 27, which have correspondingly been canceled.

Claim 19 has been further amended to delete a redundant element introduced by a prior amendment.

**Claim Objections**

The Office Action objected to claim 19 because that claim contained a redundant element. Claim 19 has been amended, as noted above, to remove the redundant element. It is believed that this amendment fully addresses the objection, and reconsideration of the amended claim is respectfully requested.

**35 U.S.C. §103 Rejection, Jennings in view of Barrett, in view of Aho**

The Office Action has rejected claims 1-3, 5, 8-13, 16-19, 21, and 23-25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jennings, in view of Barrett, in view of Aho. It is respectfully submitted that the claims, at least as amended, are allowable over any combination of Jennings, Barrett, and/or Aho.

Claim 1, for example, has been amended to recite, inter alia, "outputting, to a context-based help utility, information about the at least one graphical element identified by parsing the tokens in the web-based application;" and "providing context-based help based at least in part on the at least one graphical element in the web-based application." The Office Action, in rejecting prior claim 26, correctly notes that "the cited art of claim 1 does not expressly disclose: providing context based help based at least in part on the at least one graphical element in the web-based application." Office Action, at 12. Hence, claim 1 is allowable over the combination of Jennings, Barrett, and Aho, for at least this reason.

Based on the Office Action's rejection of claim 26, it is anticipated that the Office might argue that the addition of Strahorn to the Jennings-Barrett-Aho combination would render amended claim 1 unpatentable. The applicants respectfully submit that this is not the case. While Strahorn does generally describe a "context-based help system and method for use in a WorldWideWeb environment," Strahorn discloses a Java application that employs "a rasterized depiction of the active Web page" Strahorn, col. 4, lines 33-35, to provide context-sensitive help. Specifically, neither Strahorn nor any of the references cited against claim 1 teach or suggest "outputting, to a context-based help utility, information about the at least one graphical element identified by parsing the tokens in the web-based application," as required by claim 1.

Accordingly, claim 1 would be allowable even over the combination of Jennings, Barrett, Aho, and Strahorn.

Claim 19 recites elements similar to those of claim 1 and is allowable over the applied references for at least similar reasons. Claims 2, 3, 5, 8-13, 16-18, 21, and 23-25 all ultimately depend from either claim 1 or claim 19 and are believed to be allowable at least by virtue of this dependence.

### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance and an action to that end is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 303-571-4000.

Respectfully submitted,

/Chad E. King/  
Chad E. King  
Reg. No. 44,187

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP  
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor  
San Francisco, California 94111-3834  
Tel: 303-571-4000  
Fax: 415-576-0300  
CEK:jep  
61859756 v1